Ambiguous loyalty to the Russian Tsar: the universities of Dorpat and Helsinki as nation building institutions

Dhondt, Pieter

Ambiguous Loyalty to the Russian Tsar. The Universities of Dorpat and Helsinki as Nation Building Institutions

Pieter Dhondt [*]

Abstract: Despite several attempts in the eighteenth century to re-establish the University of Dorpat, the Baltic Germans succeeded only in 1802 in re-founding this precious institution meant for the education of the local German-speaking elite. The Baltic German nobility had power over the whole area, ruling it in political, religious, economic and cultural respect. In return for their numerous privileges, they demonstrated an almost proverbial loyalty to the Russian tsar. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, several high posts in the Russian government and in the Russian army were taken by members of the Baltic German nobility. A similar ambiguity characterized the attitude of the Finnish elite. On the one hand, the exceptionally privileged position of the Grand Duchy of Finland within the Russian empire forced them to act loyally towards their occupier. On the other hand, Finnish national awareness increased from the 1820's, a development towards which the university contributed to a large extent. As the Baltic German elite was educated at the University of Dorpat, the Finnish elite had its own university, first in Turku/Åbo and, from 1827, in Helsinki. Certainly when the university moved to the new capital, it was given explicit instructions to „build the nation". Also the location of the new imperial university was significant in this respect: on the Senate's square with at the opposite side of the square the government and next to it the imposing cathedral.

Despite several attempts in the eighteenth century to re-establish the University of Dorpat in the Russian Governorate of Livonia, the Baltic Germans succeeded only in 1802 in re-founding this precious institution meant for the education of the local German-speaking elite. The Baltic German nobility had power over the whole area, ruling it in political, religious, economic and cultural respect. In return for their numerous privileges, they demonstrated an almost proverbial loyalty to the Russian tsar. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, several high posts in the Russian government and in the Russian army were taken by members of the Baltic German nobility.

A similar ambiguity characterized the attitude of the Finnish elite. On the one hand, the exceptionally privileged position of the Grand Duchy of Finland within the Russian empire forced them to act loyally towards their occupier. On

[*] Address all communications to: Pieter Dhondt, Department of History, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 38A, 00014 Helsinki, Finland; e-mail: Pieter.Dhondt@helsinki.fi.

the other hand, Finnish national awareness increased from the 1820's, a development towards which the university contributed to a large extent. As the Baltic German elite was educated at the University of Dorpat, the Finnish elite had its own university, first in Turku/Åbo and, from 1827, in Helsinki. When the university moved to the new capital, it was given explicit instructions to "build the nation".

The move of the university from Turku to Helsinki involved a reform of the statutes, which was preceded by some smaller adjustments in the organisation and administration of the university in 1811, shortly after the incorporation of Finland into the Russian empire. These reforms, as well as the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat, the foundation of a University in Saint Petersburg in 1817 and the reform and renaming of the Vilnian Academy into Imperial University of Vilna in 1803, were all part of the general university reform of Alexander I. Inspired by enlightened absolutism, the Russian tsar intended to uplift his subjects, convinced that "reforms which are made by the power of the state generally are not lasting. Therefore, it is better and easier to lead people to improvement by simply opening to them the path to their own improvement. Supervising from a distance the peoples' activities, the state can arrange matters to assist them to take the path to improvement without using any kind of force," as it was expressed by one of his closest advisors, count Mikhail Mikhailovich Speransky.[1]

The University of Göttingen functioned as a model for all these reforms and especially its unusual combination of, on the one hand, extensive freedom allowed to the professors, and on the other hand, the absence of any permanent financial endowment, making the university directly dependent on the state.[2] The professors in Göttingen had the task of providing vocational training at a high professional level, without surrendering either philosophical studies of the enlightened empiricist and idealist type, or the values of the old classical curriculum. Following the German example, the curator at the reformed Russian universities was responsible for the continuous communication between the university and the government, but to guarantee the autonomy of the university he was not allowed to reside within the university city. The faculties of theology, medicine and particularly law had to train men who could carry forward the programs of the constitutional state, but at the same time they had to pay attention to theoretical knowledge and to the general development of scholarship.[3]

---

[1] Cited by James T. Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 1802-1835* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press 1988), p. ix.

[2] Robert D. Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914* (Oxford: University Press 2004), pp. 24-25.

[3] Flynn, The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 1988, p. 8.

Gradually, the reform of higher education became simultaneously a means and an end. To realise a thorough reform of Russian society in general, well-trained jurists were needed, so that the university reform itself was pursued as one of the essential reforms. Crucial for the success of the system, which was largely developed by Speransky, was to attract members of the nobility and the higher bourgeoisie to the universities as much as possible. Therefore a connection was made between obtaining academic degrees and the position in the table of ranks. This formal list of positions and ranks in the military, the government and the court of Imperial Russia was introduced by Peter the Great in 1722. It determined a person's position and status according to service to the tsar, rather than to birth or seniority. The position in the table of ranks became at least partly dependent on the education of the person concerned, which became a significant motivation to attend the university. University studies and public service were thus closely connected to each other and the training of civil servants remained (one of) the most important task(s) of the university, a position which seriously restricted its attempts to become a scientific institution.[4]

As at other Russian universities, those of Dorpat and Turku/Helsinki strived to produce a scientific and vocational training for the new "national" elite. Indeed, both universities were founded/reformed in order to enable the development of the region, the Baltic provinces of Estonia, Livonia, and Courland, and the Grand Duchy of Finland respectively. Both universities (which had a close relationship at the beginning of the nineteenth century) functioned increasingly as "national" institutions in the service of the local, Baltic German and Finnish elite. This position was assured through all kinds of privileges, themselves the result of, and the condition for, a high degree of loyalty towards the tsar. The central question in this article is how both universities achieved this double assignment, of being simultaneously a scientific and a vocational, national institution. As will be indicated, the universities of Dorpat and Turku/Helsinki reacted in a remarkably similar way when the Baltic German or Finnish nation was challenged in one way or another.

The first section focuses on the foundation of the University of Dorpat in 1802. What were the most significant causes for establishing a new university and what was the task of this new institution? In the second paragraph, the reform of the Academy of Turku in 1811 will be discussed, together with the reasons for moving the university to Helsinki in 1828. The main body of the article, sections 3 and 4, deals with the Imperial Alexander University and the

[4] Klaus Meyer, "Die Universität im Russischen Reich in der erste Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts", in: Gert von Pistohlkors (ed.), Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius, 1579-1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost (Quellen und Studien zur Baltischen Geschichte 9) (Köln: Böhlau 1987), pp. 49-50.

University of Dorpat as national institutions respectively. How did they achieve the desired task of offering high quality training of civil servants and the national elite that consisted of a combination of a thorough practical education, and a scientific one? The consequences of Russification at the end of the nineteenth century on the development of this policy at both universities will be examined in a short separate section, followed by the concluding paragraph in which the role of the universities of Dorpat and Helsinki as nation building institutions will be evaluated.

The establishment of the University of Dorpat

Traditionally, the ukase of Tsar Paul I of the 9th of April 1798 is considered the starting point for the re-opening of the University of Dorpat. Fearing the introduction of (French) revolutionary ideas, studies abroad were entirely prohibited. Because subjects from Estonia, Livonia and Courland were particularly affected by this decision (since they often studied at German universities), the Baltic knighthoods received permission to establish a local, protestant university as compensation. Shortly afterwards, representatives of the Estonian, Livonian and Courlandic knighthoods assembled in order to accomplish this given opportunity.[5]

However, from the beginning a great deal of disagreement existed within the Baltic German nobility about where the new university should be established. On its abolishment in 1710, the preceding Swedish university was active in Pernau/Pärnu, a city which offered the advantage of good contacts with Western Europe, mainly due to its lively port. The Estonian knighthood also supported the centrally located Weißenstein/Paide. The Livonian knighthood on the other hand voted for the equally centrally located city of Dorpat/Tartu, which was already widely known as a university city and which offered good connections with the capital. The Courlandic knighthood meanwhile preferred the city of Mitau which offered the best material conditions for the university because of the existence of the gymnasium established by the Courlandic duke Peter Biron in 1775. The new university would be able to make use of the same professors, the existing library and the available buildings.[6]

Since a consensus could not be reached, two different propositions were developed, one for Dorpat and one for Mitau, the final choice thus being left to

[5] Villu Tamul, "Die Dörptsche Universität – Landes- oder Reichsuniversität? Zum Verhältnis von Deutschbalten, Stadt und Universität im 19. Jahrhundert", in: Helmut Piirimäe and Claus Sommerhage (eds.), *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat* (Tartu: Universität, Lehrstuhl für deutsche Philologie 2000), p. 89. Tamul gives the most detailed description of the debate on the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat.

[6] *Das erste Jubelfest der Kaiserlichen Universität Dorpat, fünfundzwanzig Jahre nach ihrer Gründung gefeiert am 12. Dezember 1827* (Dorpat: Schünmann 1828), p. 25.

the tsar. After Paul I had chosen Dorpat, a commission with representatives of the knighthoods began the preparation of the foundation. Their task consisted mainly of searching for the financial means and to attract professors. However, the decision of the tsar to still establish the university in Mitau (convinced by the lobbying of some members of the Courlandic nobility), the murder of Paul I in March 1801, and the resolution of his son Alexander I to rectify the foreseen move of the university to Mitau, resulted in serious delays to the activities of the commission. Moreover, after the final decision to establish the university in Dorpat, the Courlandic knighthood withdrew itself from the project.

The resulting financial difficulties were largely met by endowments and other forms of financial support from Alexander I, so that on the 21st of April 1802, the new university was able to open its doors. The administration of the university was controlled by the curatorium, a board of representatives of the knighthoods, and in that way the university acted largely as a typically early modern German *Landesuniversität*,[7] a university in the service of the local political or religious rulers. This immediately resulted in a tense conflict between the conservative, locally oriented Baltic German nobility on the one hand, and the more progressive, open-minded, often German professors on the other hand. For instance, influenced by enlightened philosophy, many of the professors advocated the abolishment of serfdom, an attitude for which the Baltic German landowners naturally would not show any sympathy.

The fact that the inauguration ceremony of the university was spread over two days was illustrative of this conflict. The first day was dominated by the knighthoods, as the professors had to swear an oath before the curatorium to serve scientific ideals and the interests of the state (meaning the Baltic provinces). The second day consisted of the academic ceremony with, among other speeches, the address of the first rector of the university Georg Friedrich Parrot, in which he called on the audience to gauge the value of the work of the lower classes, the farmers. Only one month later, on the occasion of the visit of Alexander I to Dorpat, the conflict between the curatorium and the board of professors came to a head. To the great annoyance of the conservative curatorium, Parrot delivered a marvellous speech directed at the progressive, enlightened ruler.[8] It would form the beginning of a warm friendship between Alexander I and "his little Voltaire".[9]

---

[7] Willem Frijhoff, "Patterns", in: Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. II: Universities in the Early Modern Period* (Cambridge: University Press 1997), pp. 43-105.

[8] Roderich von Engelhardt, *Die deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Schriften der deutschen Akademie 13) (München: Ernst Reinhardt 1933), pp. 39-40. It includes the entire version of Parrot's French speech.

[9] Tamul, "Die Dörptsche Universität – Landes- oder Reichsuniversität?", 2000, p. 96.

Some months later, after the establishment of the Russian ministry of education, Parrot left for Saint Petersburg with the intention of withdrawing the administration of the university from the knighthoods, and to place Dorpat under the general control of the Russian educational system. In December 1802, the Imperial University of Dorpat received a new charter of foundation and became one of the Russian state universities, one among the others. The advantages of the transformation from a *Landesuniversität* into a state university were obvious. Firstly, the financial conditions of the university improved significantly and secondly, the autonomy of the professors increased to a large extent, following the philosophy of the general university reform. However, the supervision under the knighthoods that had previously been in place was simply recplaced by the somewhat less rigorous control of the ministry of education. The knighthoods were largely put aside and, as such, this transformation was an excellent example of enlightened absolutist policy: the use of state power against the traditional rights of established elites.[10] Nevertheless, the knighthoods still maintained a certain degree of influence on the university and therefore the conflict between the conservative Baltic German nobility and the more progressive, professorial body would surface regularly.

According to the statute of 1803, the university was set up "for the general welfare of the Russian empire and in particular for the benefit of Livonia, Estonia, Courland and Finland".[11] In that sense, the university had to pay attention to courses of local interest, such as provincial law, without training lawyers and advocates who would be able to practise only in the Baltic provinces. Professors at the faculty of medicine should concentrate on local health problems and the local medical practice, but physicians educated at the University of Dorpat should be employable in the whole the Russian empire. The university also aimed to combine a scientific and vocational mission, but certainly in the early years the educational program in Dorpat was a bit less abstract than at its German counterparts.[12]

In his account on the festivities on the occasion of the inauguration of the new university, the originally German professor of philosophy Gottlob Benjamin Jäsche emphasized as one of the advantages of an indigenous university, precisely the possibility of applying knowledge to the local circumstances. Besides, he conformed himself perfectly to the prevailing view by indicating the dangers connected to the studies abroad: the threat to the good morals of the

---

[10] Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I*, 1988, p. 42.

[11] Until 1811, Finland was included in the educational circuit of the University of Dorpat. Within a circuit, schools were to be supervised by a school board set up at the local university. Karl Siilivask (ed.), *History of Tartu University 1632-1982* (Tallinn: Perioodika 1985), pp. 83-84.

[12] Michel Garleff, "Dorpat als Universität der baltischen Provinzen im 19. Jahrhundert", in: Pistohlkors (ed.), *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius*, 1987, pp. 144-145.

students, the risk that they would too much enjoy the artificially high degree of freedom and would not want to come back, and finally, Jäsche was sure that it would be better to be first convinced by all the good things of the native country, rather than going abroad to be acquainted with the advantages of foreign universities and to adopt these afterwards at home.[13] The state University of Dorpat was thus clearly focussing on the local region, but at the same time closely involved in the general Russian educational system, much more than was the case for the University of Turku/Helsinki.

The reform of the Academy of Turku and the move to Helsinki

Still, during the Finnish War against Sweden, Alexander I affirmed that Finland would never be treated on the same terms as the other Russian governorates. On the 4th of June 1808, when the outcome of the war was still far from evident, the tsar accepted responsibility for the university and confirmed all its numerous privileges.[14] When in the peace treaty of September 1809, Finland became part of the Russian empire, the existing Gustavian constitution of 1772 was retained and the prevailing customs, religion and language (Swedish among the higher and Finnish among the lower classes) were preserved and even protected. Moreover, by convening the estates of Finland, the Emperor recognized their existence and considered them the representatives of the Finnish nation.[15] Finland served only as a military buffer zone against Sweden.

Therefore, it was also rather easy to convince the Finns to unite themselves with the rising might of Russia rather than with the declining power of Sweden,[16] especially when the defeat of the latter caused a revolution in Stockholm which resulted in the adoption of a new constitution and a new royal house. The Academy in Turku also immediately took sides with the enlightened ruler Alexander I, who supported education to a large extent. Already in May 1808, the rector incited all the university members to swear allegiance to the tsar.

---

[13] Gottlob Benjamin Jäsche, *Geschichte und Beschreibung der Feyerlichkeiten..., der neu angelegten Kaiserlichen Universität zu Dorpat* (Dorpat: Grenzius 1803), pp. 10-14.

[14] Matti Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität. Die Universität Helsinki 1640-1990* (Helsinki: Otava 1990), p. 207.

[15] Matti Klinge, "Continuity in Finnish Representation", in. Id., *The Finnish Tradition. Essays on structures and identities in the North of Europe* (Helsinki: SHS 1993), p. 49.

[16] Jan Hecker-Stampehl, "Functions of Academic Mobility and Foreign Relations in Finnish Academic Life. A Historical Survey from the Middle Ages until the Middle of the 20th Century", in: Catherine-F. Gicquel, Victor Makarov and Magdalena Zolkos (eds.), *The Challenge of Mobility in the Baltic Sea Region* (The Baltic Sea Region. Nordic Dimensions – European Perspectives 2) (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag 2005), p. 25.

Gradually the university even developed into a centre for an Alexander-type cult, although a few professors opposed this trend of course.[17]

As soon as the future administration of the Grand Duchy of Finland had been settled in the summer of 1809, action was taken with regard to the development and reformation of the university. A number of proposals passed under review, amongst which was that of the rector and medical professor Gabriel Erik von Haartman. In an enlightened vein, he argued for a university which was closely connected to practical life by paying special attention to vocational training, e.g. by the introduction of commercial and industrial courses and by focussing on practical education at the medical faculty. Still, the university should not lose its neo-humanistic approach and therefore Haartman emphasized the central position of the faculty of philosophy. By offering courses such as literary history or history of sciences, it should guarantee the thoroughly scholarly approach of the education at the higher faculties.[18]

The reform which was implemented in 1811 was much more conservative. The most noticeable innovations were the improvement of the financial condition of the university, the increase in the number of chairs (indeed, firstly at the philosophical faculty) and the appointment of many assistants whose responsibility it was to lighten the educational burden of the professors and offer them more time for research. Furthermore, these assistants created the opportunity of developing a broader curriculum. The reform fitted perfectly in with the general university reform of Alexander I, according to which the university should become simultaneously a scientific and a vocational institution.

However, after only a few years, the university concentrated itself increasingly on the training of civil servants, much needed for the new nation. As a matter of fact, the civil service gradually acquired a powerful position in Finland due to, among other reasons, the estates not convening any more until 1863. From 1817, a degree of the indigenous university became a precondition for Finnish legal and administrative offices. The university obtained the monopoly on the training of civil servants and developed increasingly into an education institution for administrative officials.[19] The introduction of the new civil service examinations at the university did not only result in a more practical approach of the educational program, but also the moral dimension of the (vocational) training received particular notice. Indeed, civil servants should set the common people a moral example, it was said. They should be honest and well-mannered citizens, members of an enlightened bureaucracy.[20]

---

[17] Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität*, 1990, p. 214.
[18] Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität*, 1990, pp. 216-218.
[19] Esa Konttinen, "Central Bureaucracy and the Restriction of Education in Early Nineteenth-century Finland", *Scandinavian Journal of History* 21 (1996), no. 3, pp. 206-207.
[20] Jussi Välimaa, "Nationalisation, Localisation and Globalisation in Finnish Higher Education", *Higher Education* 48 (2004), no. 1, pp. 28-29.

Despite growing attention for the moral education of the students, the Russian government feared that the university, left alone in Turku without the neighbouring presence of the state bureaucracy, would turn into a hotbed of oppositional activity. Complaints about rising alcohol consumption among the students, about violent conflict between students and Russian soldiers, and about liberal, oppositional professors, were increasingly often heard. As elsewhere in Europe, a reactionary policy dominated in Russia from 1815. After the conference of Vienna, Alexander I presented himself as almost personally responsible for preserving the conservative order, together with – among others – the Austrian diplomat Prince Klemens Wenzel von Metternich. At the Academy of Turku, this resulted in limitations on the possibilities for professors and students to visit foreign universities and some professors were even forced to resign.[21] The fire in Turku in 1827 presented a good excuse to move the university to the new capital of Helsinki, where supervision would be much easier.

The introduction of the civil service examinations in 1817 had already connected the university very closely to the interests of the state, but once the university was moved to Helsinki this connection became even more apparent. The location of the new Imperial Alexander University on Senate's square was significant, with the government residing on the opposite side of the square, whilst next to it stood the imposing cathedral. Nevertheless, the university maintained its autonomy to a large extent. It characterized itself in this period often as a free university whose task was to fashion a national ideology.[22]

The university owed its large degree of freedom to its excessive loyalty, itself partly the result of the benevolent attitude of Tsar Alexander I. The generous donation of 1811 was confirmed in 1828, and even somewhat completed, and most of the Finnish academics felt great satisfaction when they moved into the new buildings in Helsinki. In spite of this, the Swedes could not comprehend Finnish loyalty to Tsar Alexander I, whom they saw as an enemy, while for the Finns he was a hero.[23] The university authorities had also made a wise move in 1817, when bishop Tengström retired as vice-chancellor. Instead of insisting on the right to elect the new chancellor, they left the choice to the tsar himself, and until 1894 the function was given to the tsarevitch.[24] In practical terms, the office was held by the secretary of state for Finnish affairs which determined that the development of the university was in accordance with the

[21] Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität*, 1990, pp. 277-278.

[22] Matti Klinge, "Université et Nation", in: Märtha Norrback and Kristina Ranki (eds.), *University and Nation. The University and the Making of the Nation in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Societas Historica Finlandiae. Studia Historica 53) (Helsinki: SHS 1996), p. 18.

[23] Hecker-Stampehl, "Functions of Academic Mobility", 2005, p. 28.

[24] Anto Leikola, "In service of the truth or of the Emperor. Some reflections on the loyalties of the University of Finland", in: Norrback and Ranki (eds.), *University and Nation*, 1996, p. 127.

rule over Finland in general. At the other Russian universities on the other hand, the curator constituted the connection between the university and the government, i.e. the ministry of education.

The success of the formula, loyalty to the government in exchange for far-reaching privileges and material support, led to the continuation of this policy throughout a large part of the nineteenth century. At the time of the Polish rebellion in 1830, during the series of revolutions in 1848, after the Crimean War in the 1850s and at the time of the second Polish rebellion in 1863, the Finns and the University of Helsinki in particular actively supported the policy of the government, or at least made no use of the opportunity to enforce more rights for themselves in a radical way.[25]

The Imperial Alexander University as a national institution

In the same period as when the Finnish university was moved from Turku to Helsinki, many other universities were founded in the capital cities of Europe: Berlin in 1810, Oslo in 1811, Warsaw in 1816, Saint Petersburg in 1817, Brussels in 1834, London and Madrid in 1836. As with the University of Helsinki, most of them had a clearly national character, attracting students from all over the country. Often their primary task was training the upper levels of the civil service, reinforcing the close-knit ties between the university and the state.[26]

The transformation of the Academy of Turku into an institution in the service of the national (Finnish) state began in 1817 with the introduction of the civil service examinations. Certainly though it was from 1828 that building up the nation became even more explicitly the task of the university. Supported by the Russian government, the university had to explore their own Finnish culture in its broadest sense. The study of Finnish history, language and folklore was especially stimulated, but a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the homeland as such was needed too, and therefore biologists, zoologists, physicists, geographers and geologists were also involved in the so-called Finland project.[27] National was understood here in a rather wide sense, including connections to other Finno-Ugrian cultures.

By studying the own country and emphasizing its Finnishness, the idea was to alienate the Finns from their Swedish past. The Russification of Finland had never been an option, but to enforce the connection of Finland to Russia, the

[25] Matti Klinge, "From the French to the Russian Revolution: Finland in transition", in: Id., *Let us Be Finns - Essays on History* (Helsinki: Otava 1990), p. 102.

[26] Laura Kolbe, "The university town as a Lieu de mémoire: student identity and manifestations at the University of Helsinki 1828-1990", *History of Universities* 14 (1995-1996), pp. 183-184.

[27] Päiviö Tommila and Aura Korppi-Tommola (eds.), *Research in Finland - A History* (Helsinki: University Press 2006), pp. 49-51.

close ties with Sweden had to be cut, at least to some extent. Obviously this goal was easier to reach in Helsinki than in the more Swedish minded city of Turku. Swedish itself, as the language of the ruling class and the language of instruction at the university, was not put into question yet, but research on the Finnish language was encouraged largely, e.g. by supporting the Finnish Literature Society established in 1831. The aim of the society was to preserve and make known to the public the riches of the Finnish language and to establish the rules of a modern language. Moreover, by the introduction of special scholarships, the Russian government encouraged research trips to Dorpat, Tallinn or Saint Petersburg which were mainly used for studying Finno-Ugrian languages.[28] The idea behind these measures was to promote the coming into existence of an independent Finnish national culture. "We are no longer Swedes, Russians we shall never be, let us be Finns", it was stated.[29]

Although research thus became an important task assigned to professors, only little of it filtered through to the level of the students. With regard to its educational program from 1828, the university became (even more than before) an institution almost exclusively intended for the training of civil servants. The conviction that universities had to offer real vocational training gradually replaced the idea that the universities' main task was to provide a general education and that the vocational qualifications would be acquired later on.[30] In the eighteenth century, the Academy of Turku still focussed entirely on the training of priests, but the university increasingly concentrated on the training of Finnish civil servants, certainly after the development of Finland into a separate administrative unit in 1809. And although knowledge of Russian and Russian history was required in the civil service examinations from 1828, almost all the graduates of the University of Helsinki ended up in their own national, Finnish labour market (in contrast to, for instance, graduates of the University of Dorpat in this period).

In Finnish historiography, the cliché that the new university at Berlin was used as a model for the reorganisation in 1828 prevails, but the desire to use the Turku Academy particularly for the training of civil servants pointed in another direction.[31] Still, neo-humanistic tendencies noticeable at many German universities were not completely put aside. The philosophical faculty secured a central position in the whole university system and, in addition to the civil

---

[28] Yrjö Blomstedt, "Suomesta kotoisin olevat ylioppilaat Tarton yliopistossa 1802-1852", *Genos* 20 (1949), pp. 28-35 and Hain Tankler, "Dorpat, a German-speaking International University in the Russian Empire", in: Norrback and Ranki (eds.), *University and Nation*, 1996, pp. 91-100.

[29] Matti Klinge, "Finnish Literature Society", in: Id., *Let us Be Finns*, 1990, p. 134.

[30] Matti Klinge, Rainer Knapas, Anto Leikola and John Strömberg, *Keisarillinen Aleksanterin Yliopisto 1808-1917 [The Imperial Alexander University 1808-1917]* (Helsinki: Otava 1989), p. 334.

[31] Hecker-Stampehl, "Functions of Academic Mobility", 2005, p. 27.

service examinations, academic examinations were also retained with a more scholarly interpretation. However, particularly at the faculty of law, the most popular faculty by far, the number of students who aspired to these academic degrees was extremely small. Indeed, the professors received the task of carrying out research, but the *Einheit von Lehre und Forschung* which was strived for by the German neo-humanist Wilhelm von Humboldt, was totally absent.

The increase in the number of civil servants trained in the service of the Finnish nation resulted in a growing Finnish consciousness in the 1830s. It was characterized by an idealization of the Finnish peasantry in a romantic, conservative and neo-classical tradition and, as such, it did not offend the loyal attitude towards the Russian government. The growing sense of nationhood received a literary application in collections of Finnish poetry, such as "The Kalevala, or old Karelian poems about the ancient time of the Finnish people" compiled in 1835 by Elias Lönnrot, professor of philology at the university. New Finnish societies were established in addition to the Finnish Literature Society, e.g. the Societas Scientiarum Fennica / Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten (The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters) in 1838. It was remarkable in that it concerned a form of intellectual nationalism within the higher classes in an atmosphere of imperial loyalty, instead of a nationalism of the middle and lower classes which often resulted in a violent struggle for separate nation state.[32]

However, in the 1840s, the awareness of a gap between conservative classicism at home and liberal currents in the West intensified. A difficult balance was strived for, joining western ideals without harming the confidence of the Russian occupier. To the liberals it appeared as something national and non-governmental, whilst from the imperial viewpoint, it was acceptable as something surely non-revolutionary.[33] One of the more radical figures, the philosopher and statesman Johan Vilhelm Snellman, based his ideas on the concept of Hegel, "without a language there can be no nation". A national culture, including national literature, was needed, according to Snellman, and a true national culture could be expressed only in a national language. In Finland's case this was Finnish, a language Snellman himself never used in writing. Swedish was still the cultural and conversational language of the educated classes. At that time Snellmans views were a little too drastic and when he announced a lecture

[32] Henrik Stenius, "The 'Bildungsbürgertum' and the free discussion in nineteenth century Finland", in: Matti Peltonen (ed.), *State, Culture & the Bourgeoisie. Aspects of the Peculiarity of the Finnish* (Jyväskylän yliopisto. Nykykulttuurin tutkimusyksikkö 13) (Jyväskylä: Yliopistopaino 1989), p. 60.

[33] Klinge, "Université et Nation", 1996, p. 18.

series about "the true sense of academic freedom" in 1837, he was practically dismissed from the university.[34]

This repressive measure resulted also out of the general reactionary political climate established in Russia. The reign of Nicholas I began with an attempt on his life in the Decembrist Revolt in 1825, and five years later he had to put down a revolution in Poland. In 1833, the minister of education, Sergej Uvarov, devised a program of "autocracy, Orthodoxy, and nationality" as the guiding principle of the regime. The people were to show loyalty to the unlimited authority of the tsar, to the traditions of the Russian Orthodox Church, and, more vaguely, to the Russian nation. In Helsinki this policy led to some conflicts with the students, e.g. in the Nordström affair. Too many students supported Johan Jakob Nordström, professor at the law faculty, who was publicly reprimanded for his Scandinavianist and anti-Russian attitude.[35] According to the university authorities, in any case Scandinavianism was dangerously popular among the students. In addition to seeking a union between the brother nations of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, it entertained the idea of re-conquering the earlier eastern Swedish provinces, i.e. Finland; an idea which, naturally, was not well received in Russia.[36]

Nonetheless the government succeeded in making a distinction between a destructive sense of public responsibility (i.e. propagate social discontent, hostility towards Russia or Scandinavianism) and constructive activities (e.g. interest in Finnish language and culture).[37] The latter line clearly still prevailed at the students' May festivities in 1848. Instead of major demonstrations, as in many other European cities, a garden fête was organised. The singing of what would become the national hymn "Our Country", an ode to the peasant and the rural countryside, accompanied a toast to the Emperor.[38] Despite this loyal attitude, a hard line followed. Fewer students were admitted at the university and studies abroad were completely prohibited. Again, the idea was to alienate the Finns from their Swedish neighbours, since the (too liberal) Swedish universities were by far the most popular destinations of Finnish students in this period.[39]

A sign that the atmosphere had changed under Alexander II from 1855, was the permission for Snellman to come back to Helsinki. Snellman himself had

---

[34] Raija Majamaa and Leeni Tiirakari, *J. V. Snellman. Valtioviisas vaikuttaja* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1040) (Helsinki: SKS 2006).
[35] Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität*, 1990, pp. 365-366.
[36] Hecker-Stampehl, "Functions of Academic Mobility", 2005, p. 31.
[37] Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität*, 1990, pp. 381-382.
[38] Kolbe, "The university town as a Lieu de mémoire", 1995-1996, pp. 190-191.
[39] Pieter Dhondt, "Student mobility in Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The case of Finland", accepted for publication in: Fred Dervin and Mike Byram (eds.), *Travelling to study. Students, staff and academic mobility in higher education* (Cambridge: Scholars Publishing 2008).

largely abandoned his radical ideas and returned to a kind of *Realpolitik*, loyalty in exchange for more rights for the Finnish people. One of the results of this attitude was the convening of the estates, again from 1863. In this capacity, Snellman became a leading man of the so-called Fennomanian movement, which many of his colleague-professors joined. The more liberal bourgeoisie, who was striving for closer connections with the other Scandinavian countries, accused the Fennomanians of opportunism and submission.[40] However, influenced by the Russian defeat in the Crimean War, another conception of nationalism became dominant in both parties. The homeland was no longer primarily a geographical realm, but increasingly connected to the concept of people and the history of the Finnish people went back to the Swedish past. Poetry about nature did no longer suffice; challenging literature that called for action was required instead.[41]

In the creation of a Finnish national identity, the students played an extremely important part too. Already in the 1830s, Snellman was complaining about the lack of contact between the university and the rest of the society.[42] The student 'nations' tried to meet these complaints by acting as a supporting framework for both studies and social and political life, and by the provision of training in citizenship. They encouraged students to return to their home city after their studies and so contribute to the development of the countryside and promote a sense of national community. Many of the nations promoted popular education and public enlightenment in all kinds of ways. These efforts to involve the broad masses meant both the education of the nation, and the nationalisation of the education.[43]

The students were also the first to labour for the increased use of the Finnish language in university education, and with success. In 1828 a lectureship in Finnish was established and in 1850 it was transformed into a professorship. Ten years earlier, Finnish was made compulsory in the civil service examinations (first in combination with Russian, and then from the 1860s gradually to the detriment of Russian). The first secondary school which taught entirely in Finnish, was opened in 1858 and, from 1863, Finnish was recognised as one of the official languages of the administration. Simultaneously, the language question became involved in the political struggle between the Scandinavian camp and the Fennomanians, who feared that too close a connection with Sweden would prevent the advancement of Finnish. The first party was supported by a large group of older, conservative civil servants and a heterogeneous as-

[40] Matti Klinge, "The evolution of the linguistic situation in Finland", in: Id., *The Finnish Tradition*, 1993, pp. 164-165.
[41] Matti Klinge, "Runeberg's two homelands", in: Id., *The Finnish Tradition*, 1993, p. 136.
[42] Kolbe, "The university town as a Lieu de mémoire", 1995-1996, p. 186.
[43] Laura Kolbe, "Rural or uban?", in: Norrback and Ranki (eds.), *University and Nation*, 1996, p. 54.

sembly of liberals who, in the first place, opposed what they considered the collaborative policy of the Fennomanians.

From the middle of the nineteenth century, the appreciation of Finnish had increased significantly. The need for an independent Finnish national identity and civil service was accepted by the more liberal tsar ruling at that time. Together with impulses out of Germany for instance, this created better opportunities for a more scholarly approach to the education. Increasingly, it was often tried in order to compensate for the unidirectional vocational training, and was put into practise by paying more attention to the scientific assignment of the university through research courses in institutes and laboratories. Moreover, the far-reaching reform of secondary education in 1856, the general education no longer being a task of the university, made this reversal possible.

Very early on, by 1857, a chair of pathological anatomy was introduced at the University of Helsinki, but many of the other specialised medical disciplines such as bacteriology, pharmacy or psychiatry were only established from the 1870s. In the wake of this development, new institutes of meteorology, oceanography and geology were built, seminars were introduced in the humanities, and separate examinations on the philosophy of law and history of Northern Europe at the civil service examinations had to guarantee the scholarly training of future civil servants.[44] The faculty of philosophy with its two sections of history and philology on the one hand, physics and mathematics on the other hand, developed into a veritable research centre what revealed itself in a marked growth in the number of doctoral dissertations in the 1880s.[45]

The University of Dorpat as a national institution "for the whole empire"

Compared to the University of Dorpat, Helsinki ran somewhat behind in this respect. From 1817 and certainly from 1828, the Finnish university emphasized almost exclusively its role in building the nation, via the training of civil servants and developing the "national" disciplines. The first rector of Dorpat on the other hand, pointed to the importance of students and professors working together for the advancement of learning in order that Russia would achieve its own cultural apparatus, so that the country would not be indebted for ever to foreign countries concerning intellectual achievements.[46]

Much more than in Helsinki, a philosophical and scientific approach characterized the education in the first half of the nineteenth century. Like many of

[44] Klinge, Knapas, Leikola and Strömberg, *Keisarillinen Aleksanterin Yliopisto*, 1989, p. 344.
[45] Tommila and Korppi-Tommola (eds.), *Research in Finland*, 2006, pp. 57-60.
[46] Friedrich Bienemann, *Der Dorpater Professor Georg Friedrich Parrot und Kaiser Alexander I* (Reval: Franz Kluge 1902), p. 345.

his colleagues, the philosopher Jäsche was intent on encouraging his students to go beyond the bounds of their own discipline and to show them the logical connection between different sciences through encyclopaedic lectures.[47] In the pedagogical-philosophical seminars for the training of teachers, the importance of philological and scholarly exercises and research by the students was emphasized from very the beginning. The idea behind these seminars was that students who discovered grammatical or linguistic details by themselves, would be more able to explain them to their future pupils. At the faculty of law, courses like Roman law as well as philosophy and history of law were added to the curriculum.

The difference with the situation at the University of Helsinki was maybe most apparent with regard to the medical faculty. Dorpat had a pioneering role among Russian universities in introducing the most advanced forms of instruction and setting up auxiliary institutions, such as university clinics, outpatient departments, laboratories and others.[48] Already before the 1860s, the opportunities for studying chemistry were impressive, including as chemical cabinet, a pharmaceutical institute, a pharmacological institute, an agricultural-chemical laboratory and a chemical laboratory of the school for Veterinary Medicine.[49] At the same time, the philosophical background of the studies, the search for truth and understanding, was not neglected, thanks to courses such as history of medicine. Instead of giving the students a one-sided, doctrinal education, the professors attempted "to open their eyes, to enlarge their horizon, and to train them to pass their own judgements".[50]

Finally, the medical faculty in Dorpat led the way with to the introduction of specialised medical chairs: physiological chemistry in 1846, bacteriology in 1857, ophthalmology in 1857.[51] The high level of teaching and research in pharmacy became internationally known and attracted many foreign students, among whom a considerable number of Finns. Between 1802 and 1811, when Finland belonged to the educational circuit of Dorpat, the university was quite popular among Finnish students as well. From around the time of the Imperial University's move to Helsinki, the number of Finns in Dorpat increased again, but in much lesser numbers. Later the Imperial Alexander University clearly succeeded in attracting and training the national elite. Only some specialised

---

[47] Ludwig Strümpell, *Rückblick auf die Wirksamheit der Universität Dorpat. Zur Erinnerung an die Jahre von 1802-1865* (Dorpat: Mattiesen 1866), p. 82.

[48] Siilivask (ed.), *History of Tartu University*, 1985, p. 123.

[49] Strümpell, *Rückblick auf die Wirksamheit der Universität Dorpat*, 1866, p. 78.

[50] Engelhardt, *Die deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1933, p. 175.

[51] Ilo Käbin, *Die medizinische Forschung und Lehre an der Universität Dorpat/Tartu 1802-1940. Ergebnisse und Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Medizin* (Sydsvenska medicinhistoriska sällskapets årsskrift Supplementum 6) (Lüneburg: Nordostdeutsches Kulturwerk 1986), pp. 365-366.

disciplines, such as pharmacy in particular, still managed to attract some Finnish students to the University of Dorpat.[52]

Due to all of these measures Dorpat developed into a scientifically important centre, looked for by students from much beyond just the local, Baltic region. Graduates of the university worked as teachers, doctors, pharmacists, priests, agricultural engineers (Dorpat was the only university in the Russian empire to offer this specialisation), not only in the Baltic provinces, but in the whole of Russia.[53] Professors of the University of Dorpat were exceptionally well-represented in the Academy of Saint Petersburg, and took the lead in many expeditions on the part of Russia, e.g. the first climbing of the Ararat in 1829 and the exploration of the Siberian subarctic in the 1830s.[54] Parrot had clearly been successful in his purpose to make Dorpat a strong institution within the general structure of the Russian educational system.

The trust of the Russian government in the possibilities of the young university received a very concrete demonstration at the end of the 1820s, when a special institute for the training of professors was established in Dorpat. The foundation of many new universities and the extension of the existing universities had created a great need for professors. To meet this need quickly and to guarantee a high-quality education, a special institute was founded. The universities were urged to send their best students to Dorpat and the final applicants were selected after a strict entrance examination. The training itself consisted of a three-year education in Dorpat, followed by an apprenticeship of two years abroad (in Vienna or Berlin). In 1838 the institute was abolished because the need for new professors was to a large extent met.[55]

The attendance of Russia's intellectual elite at the institute for the training of professors had a stimulating effect upon the university as a whole, and was definitely one of the reasons for the scientific superiority of Dorpat in the 1820s and 1830s. Dorpat also suffered much less than other Russian universities (including Helsinki) from the reactionary policy of Nicholas I. The almost proverbial loyalty of the Baltic German nobility and their numerous privileges

---

[52] Timo Rui, "Die Deutschsprachige Universität Dorpat im 19.Jahrhundert als Hochschulort für Finnland", in: Robert Schweitzer and Waltraud Bastman-Bühner (eds.), *Der finnische Meerbusen als Brennpunkt. Wandern und Wirken deutschsprachiger Menschen im europäischen Nordosten* (Veröffentlichungen der Stiftung zur Förderung deutscher Kultur 9) (Helsinki: Stiftung zur Förderung deutscher Kultur 1998), pp. 183-189.

[53] Elmar Järvesoo, "The Role of Tartu University and Riga Polytechnic Institute in Introducing Rational Agriculture into the Baltic Provinces and Russia", in: Pistohlkors (ed.), *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius*, 1987, pp. 197-215.

[54] Reinhard Wittram, "Die Universität Dorpat im 19. Jahrhundert", *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 1 (1952), p. 203.

[55] Villu Tamul, "Das Professoreninstitut und der Anteil der Universität Dorpat/Tartu an den russisch-deutschen Wissenschaftskontakten im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 41 (1992), no. 4, pp. 525-542.

were not put into question as yet.[56] Although there were some minor conflicts with regard to the discipline of the students, the good relationships between the university and the government in Saint Petersburg (which began after the friendship between Parrot and Alexander I) were largely continued.

The excellent financial and material conditions of the university made it possible to attract many German professors, who confirmed the neo-humanistic and less purely vocational approach of the education further. It was particularly the diplomatic skills of rector Gustav Ewers, himself from Göttingen, which helped to keep Dorpat many of its privileges, despite the reactionary educational policy in general, and he also made certain that the professorial body consisted of mainly German scholars of high standing in the 1820s.[57] However, from the very beginning, a conflict existed between the rather conservative, Baltic German professors on the one hand, and the more progressive groups of foreign professors (mainly of German origin) on the other, who were not sufficiently acquainted with the local situation and traditions. Through the years, the intensity of the conflict would only increase.[58]

Certainly with regard to the composition of the professorial body, the University of Dorpat could not be considered a *Landesuniversität* in the first half of the nineteenth century. Still, in the 1840s and 1850s the number of indigenous professors increased gradually. As a consequence of the reactionary, policy of Russification after the revolutions of 1848, the University of Dorpat went on the defensive and tried to emphasize its role as a university in the service of their own, Baltic German nation, for instance by the appointment of more Baltic German professors.[59]

A similar development can be seen with regard to the students. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, graduates of Dorpat University (the so-called Baltic *Literatenstand*) had excellent employment opportunities in the whole of Russia. This was due, among other reasons, to the rather difficult beginnings of the provincial Russian universities, such as that of Kharkiv and Kazan (both established in 1804), in comparison to Dorpat. Of course, the fact that many of these well-educated students, the largest majority being of Baltic German origin, left the Baltic States after their studies, resulted in a slight decrease of Baltic German influence in their own provinces.[60] When the leading role of the Baltic German nobility was challenged from the middle of the nineteenth cen-

[56] Cf. Wilfried Schlau (ed.), *Die Deutschbalten* (Studienbuchreihe der Stiftung Ostdeutscher Kulturrat 6) (München: Langen Müller 1995).

[57] Lea Leppik, "Ein deutscher Professor im Russischen Reich. Über Leben und Werk des Historikers Gustav Ewers", in: Piirimäe and Sommerhage (eds.), *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat*, 2000, pp. 113-141.

[58] Siilivask (ed.), *History of Tartu University*, 1985, pp. 95-96.

[59] Cf. Trude Maurer, *Hochschullehrer im Zarenreich. Ein Beitrag zur russischen Sozial- und Bildungsgeschichte* (Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas 27) (Köln: Böhlau 1998).

[60] Garleff, "Dorpat als Universität der baltischen Provinzen im 19. Jahrhundert", 1987, p. 149.

tury, an increasing number of students decided to remain in their own region after their education. This development was also caused by the strengthened position of the provincial universities, itself partly the result of the stimulating influence of these professors who had received their education at the pedagogical institute in Dorpat. According to the Estonian historian Villu Tamul, these professors in particular have contributed to a large extent to the development of Russian universities, not being subjected entirely to a system of complete supervision by minister Uvarov, during the reign of Nicholas I.[61]

However, one should not exaggerate the position of the University of Dorpat as a scientific institution in the first half of the nineteenth century either. Particularly the faculty of law presented itself often as acting in the service of the state, in the narrow, Baltic German, meaning of the word. Moreover, to be appointed in the civil service, a degree from the University of Dorpat was required.[62] But in comparison to the University of Helsinki, the students were more equally divided over the different faculties, with even a preponderance of the medical faculty. Also the teachers' training institute was focussed on training teachers for their own region, and the explicit task of the school commission was to staff and develop local primary and secondary schools. Finally, the role of the University of Dorpat as a "national", vocational institution showed itself in the position of the theological faculty, intended for the training of Lutheran ministers, indeed again for the whole Russian empire.[63]

This task of the university received additional attention after the (in Dorpat at least, fairly moderate) U-turn in the policy of Alexander I from 1815. Dorpat grew stronger, though the position of a German Protestant university in Russia had yet to be worked out.[64] Curator Lieven, a typically Baltic German nobleman, served as a figure of compromise. On the one hand he supervised conscientiously the orthodoxy of the religious doctrine, for instance by the appointment of some Lutheran professors of pietist convictions, but on the other hand he enforced at the same time the role of the university as an Evangelical-Lutheran and thus Baltic German institution.

When the university was challenged by the Russification attempts of minister Uvarov, it characterized itself even more as a national institution. Lievens successor from 1835, curator G. von Craffström, resided in Dorpat instead of Saint Petersburg. The inevitable limitation of the autonomy of the university as a result of this, showed itself in different ways: stricter requirements concerning the knowledge of Russian for students as well as for professors, the dis-

[61] Tamul, "Das Professoreninstitut", 1992, p. 538.
[62] Axel von Gernet, *Die im Jahre 1802 eröffnete Universität Dorpat und die Wandlungen in ihrer Verfassung. Ein Gedenkblatt zum 21. April 1902* (Reval: Franz Kluge 1902), p. 14.
[63] Hugo Semel (ed.), *Die Universität Dorpat* (1802-1918). Skizzen zu ihrer Geschichte von Lehrern und ehemaligen Schülern (Dorpat: Laakmann 1918), pp. 158-160.
[64] Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I*, 1988, p. 136.

missal of some of the too explicitly German-minded professors, an extension of the powers of the curator, rigid disciplinary supervision on the students, and the prosecution of student societies.[65] It appeared to be more and more difficult to reach the ideal of a university in the service of the whole Russian empire, without responding to the demands of the provincial, Baltic *Sonderleben*.

Indeed, in these years several reforms proposed by the Russian government could still be prevented by the protest of a large number of professors, but the gradual change in atmosphere at the university could not be stopped. The progressive, primarily scholarly oriented German professors were increasingly replaced by conservative, Baltic German colleagues who wanted to pay more attention again to courses of local interest, and considered the university responsible in the first place for the vocational training of the future Baltic German national elite.

The more liberal attitude after the assumption of power by Alexander II in 1855 revealed itself in the authorization of student societies, but at the end of the 1860s, the conflict between the Russian government and the Baltic Germans reached another climax. The new curator from 1862, Keyserling, supported an ideology of scholarly liberalism which brought him into conflict with a large majority of the professors at the theological faculty. Increasingly often, Keyserling was annoyed about the conservatism and the intellectual narrowness of the university staff.[66]

The Russian publicist Yuri Samarin went even much further in his criticism. In his publication from 1869 about the border regions of Russia and the Russian Baltic Sea area in particular, he accused the Baltic Germans of trying to release the Baltic provinces from the Russian empire. Since the Russian government at that moment still pursued a rather moderate line with regard to Russification, Samarins work was immediately forbidden. Nevertheless, Carl Schirren, professor of Russian history at the University of Dorpat, had been able to read the book and to react to it. Through his *Livländische Antwort*, he aspired to influence foreign (mainly the German) public opinion to the advantage of the Baltic Germans. Indeed, generally speaking, they received little support in their protest against the Russian reforms. The liberal bourgeoisie of Germany, France or Belgium, was indeed rather favourable to the reduction of the old-fashioned, noble privileges in the Baltic provinces. Schirrens main aim though was to strengthen the public spirit among the Baltic Germans.[67] The

---

[65] "Der Minister der Volksaufklärung Graf Uwarow über die dorpater Universität im J. 1833", *Baltische Monatsschrift* 31 (1884), pp. 500-510.

[66] Engelhardt, *Die deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1933, p. 122.

[67] Michael Haltzel, *Der Abbau der deutschen ständischen Selbstverwaltung in den Ostseeprovinzen Russlands. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der russischen Unifizierungspolitik, 1855-1905* (Marburger Ostforschungen 37) (Marburg: J.G. Herder-Institut 1977), p. 36.

Livländische Antwort was also forbidden immediately after publication and Schirren himself promptly lost his chair in Dorpat, but still, both publications would determine the attitude of both groups in the decades to follow.[68]

In the same period, Baltic German superiority was challenged increasingly by the growing national consciousness of Estonians and Latvians. Until then, an educated Estonian or Latvian was considered to be close to something impossible. Once they had received a certain *Bildung*, they would become German. At least until the 1860s, the difference between Baltic Germans on the one hand and Estonians and Latvians on the other was based on a distinction between social classes (and to a lesser extent languages) and not between nationalities.[69] The reproach which is often made towards the Baltic Germans is that they totally neglected to germanise the agricultural class, which constituted a major difference with the situation in Finland.[70] The increase in the number of Estonian and Latvian students at the University of Dorpat and the building up of a national identity was supported by the Russians, who entered into a pragmatic coalition with the Latvian and Estonian people against the Baltic Germans.[71]

As a consequence of all this, the university became fused with its environment even more so than before in many respects. The university authorities tried to appoint as many Baltic Germans professors as possible, although they could not prevent the number of Russian professors increasing as well. The university developed into an extremely conservative institution. Schleiden, professor of plant physiology and anthropology, dedicated himself to introducing Darwinist ideas at the medical faculty, but he had the whistle blown on him irrevocably. The faculty of theology remained one of the most orthodox theoretical citadels of Lutheranism in the whole of Europe.[72] Only a little was left of the scholarly verve from the beginning of the century.

---

[68] Cf. Anders Henriksson, *The tsar's loyal Germans. The Riga German Community: Social Change and the Nationality Question, 1855-1905* (East European monographs 131) (Boulder: East European monographs 1983).

[69] Toivo U. Raun, "The Role of Tartu University in Estonian Society and Culture, 1860-1914", in: Pistohlkors (ed.), *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius*, 1987, pp. 123-142.

[70] Engelhardt, *Die deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1933, p. 319.

[71] Paulis Lazda, "The phenomenon of Russophilism in the development of Latvian Nationalism in the 19th century", in: Aleksander Loit (ed.), *National movements in the Baltic countries during the nineteenth* century (Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia 2) (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International 1985), pp. 129-136 and Mart Laar, *Äratajad. Rahvuslik ärkamisaeg Eestis 19. sajandil ja selle kandjad [Awakeners. The national awaking in Estonia in XIX century and its bearers]* (Tartu: Kirjastus Eesti Ajalooarhiiv 2005).

[72] Siilivask (ed.), *History of Tartu University*, 1985, p. 112.

Russification in Dorpat and Helsinki [73]

Real Russification started in Dorpat in 1881, while at the other Russian universities autonomy was completely restrained. The murder of Alexander II caused the extremely reactionary attitude of his successor Alexander III. Especially at the universities fell victim to this policy, since they were characterized as hotbeds of tsar-killers, were the victims of this policy found. The new statute of 1884, common for all the Russian universities (except Helsinki), regulated the number of students rigidly and intended to prevent further politicizing of the universities. In Dorpat the number of Russian students and Russian professors increased further,[74] and German frequently replaced by Russian as the language of education. Finally, in 1889 the university was renamed the Imperial University of Jur'ev.[75]

The enactment of Russification measures started somewhat later in Finland and never went that far. At the University of Helsinki, chairs in Russian constitutional law and Russian history were established, in 1900 a decree was promulgated to begin the use of Russian as the language of administration; and the Military Service Law of 1901 disbanded the Finnish army and required Finnish recruits to serve outside of Finland.[76] Some people within the Fennomanian party were prepared to accept the government measures out of fear for worse, but the great majority of the intellectual elite petitioned, with limited success, the Russian administration to preserve the particular situation of Finland.[77]

The reaction in both countries was the same: seeking closer connections to Germany. The excellent diplomatic and dynastical connections between Russia and Germany in the 1870s (they supported each other in the fight against any social and/or national revolutionary movements), deteriorated gradually from the 1880s, mainly because Germany developed into a rival force in the Baltic Sea area. According to the line of reasoning that the enemy of my enemy is my

---

[73] Edward C. Thaden (ed.), *Russification in the Baltic provinces and Finland, 1855-1914* (Princeton: University Press 1981).

[74] Sirje Tamul, "Über die Studentenschaft der russifizierten Tartuer Universität (1883-1918)", *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 4 (2001), pp. 102-111.

[75] The university was named after Yaroslav I. the Wise, who would have established the city of Dorpat/Jur'ev (Juri was the name he had taken when baptised) in the 11th century. Yaroslav I was thrice Grand Prince of Novgorod and Kiev, uniting the two principalities for a time under his rule. Cf. Helmut Piirimäe, "Wechselvolle Zeiten. Die Entwicklung Dorpats zu einem Zentrum von Wissenschaft und Kultur", in: Piirimäe and Sommerhage (eds.), *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat*, 2000, pp. 7-39.

[76] Toivo U. Raun, "The Revolution of 1905 in the Baltic Provinces and Finland", *Slavic Review* 43 (1984), p. 459 and Tuomo Polvinen, *Imperial Borderland: Bobrikov and the Attempted Russification of Finland 1894-1904* (London: Hurst 1995).

[77] Hannes Saarinen, "Studien- und Bildungsreisen von Finnen nach Berlin 1809-1914", in: A. Tammisto, K. Mustakallio and Hannes Saarinen (eds.), *Miscellanea* (Studia Historica 33) (Helsinki: SHS 1989), p. 229.

friend, many Finnish professors strived for closer relationships with German universities as a reaction to increasing Russification. Obviously, the cultural, economic and scientific superiority of Germany, and the high number of specialised disciplines studied in German universities (which were not offered in Helsinki yet) were equally or even more important factors in this development.[78] In the Baltic provinces the orientation towards Germany had already started with the German unification of 1870 and was enforced during the 1880s, but the German authorities did not want to respond too enthusiastically, for fear of offending Russia.[79]

Of course, the outcome of the story was completely different in the two countries. Finland stayed remarkably calm during the revolution of 1905. The population held itself apart from the revolutionary activism in Russia which led to the tsar's accession to the demands to revoke the worst aspects of Russification and for implementing universal suffrage. In the Baltic provinces on the other hand, Latvians and Estonians joined the violent resistance against the establishment, demanding more political power and an improvement in their economic situation. The revolt was suppressed quickly and brutally by the Baltic Germans, with the necessary aid of the Russians, but the tide could not be turned backwards.[80] Both regions would make use of the chaos in Russia after the revolution of 1917. Finland became an independent country under Finnish government, Estonia and the University of Dorpat were ruled entirely by Estonians from 1919.

The universities of Dorpat and Helsinki as nation building institutions

In the end, the Baltic German nobles had thus lost their struggle to preserve their privileges which had remained completely unchallenged during centuries. At that time, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the University of Dorpat was a Baltic German university indeed, but it could allow itself the liberty of paying only scant attention to the agenda of nation building. As with all the other Russian universities (including Helsinki), it was involved in the general

[78] Dhondt, "Student mobility in Europe", 2008.

[79] Within the Baltic German elite the enthusiasm towards Germany was not uncontested either. Indeed, the German victory and unification in 1870 were received with much joy, but simultaneously the fear for the spread of the idea of the *Nationalstaat* with one nation per state increased. Within this conception there would be no place for the Baltic German nation in the Russian state.

[80] Raun, "The Revolution of 1905", 1984, pp. 453-467 and Jürgen von Hehn, "Das Baltische Deutschtum zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917", in: Andrew Ezergailis and Gert von Pistohlkors (eds.), *Die baltischen Provinzen Russlands zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917* (Quellen und Studien zur baltischen Geschichte 4) (Köln: Böhlau 1982), pp. 43-57.

university reform of Alexander I and strove for vocational training in a philosophical, encyclopaedic and scientific setting. But far-reaching privileges created the opportunity for Dorpat and Helsinki to play an important role in the conservation of the elite, and the coming into existence of a new one, respectively. As soon as the nation was challenged, both universities, Dorpat and Helsinki, emphasized this national, vocational task at the expense of the scholarly approach to education.

In Finland, the nation was challenged from 1809 by its Swedish past. Supported by the Russian government, the University of Turku/Helsinki acted as a national institution through the training of the required number of civil servants, and through exploring the country and so helping the construction of a national identity. When, from the 1860s, the Finnish civil service was functioning smoothly, when a national consciousness was created, when the students had contributed to the coming into existence of a national community, and when the Finnish language had acquired a respectable position, the university could focus more on its role as a scientific institution. Many other factors contributed to this development too, such as impulses out of Germany and the liberal attitude of Alexander II, who considered Finland a test case for reforms, which were easier to test in a small, homogeneous country than in the whole of Russia.

Dorpat on the other hand, although it also began as a *Landesuniversität*, was transformed into a state university for the service of the whole Russian empire within one year. It was significant because of its over-regional function, the high scientific quality of its education, and the foundation of a separate institute with the purpose of training professors for all of the Russian universities. However, as soon the Baltic German nation was challenged by the Russians, the university turned back into a closed, narrow-minded *Landesuniversität*; firstly to a very limited extent after 1815 (by emphasizing its role as an Evangelical-Lutheran institution), secondly in a somewhat more pronounced form from 1835, and lastly, and more notably, from the end of the 1860s. When in the same period the Estonian and Latvian lower classes built up their national identity and asserted their rights, conservatism prevailed at the entire university.

Of course, one should not exaggerate this picture and its primarily relational interpretation of the development at both universities. Dorpat was a scientific, research university to a much larger extent at the end of the nineteenth century than it had been at the beginning. However, compared to other European universities, Dorpat stood clearly at the top in the 1820s and 1830s, whilst in the 1870s and 1880s it belonged, at most, to the middle strata and certainly at the other end of the spectrum compared to the University of Helsinki. Even after the reforms of 1811 and 1828, an important neo-humanistic interpretation of education was preserved, what became clear, for instance, in the high position of the philosophical faculty. Nevertheless, in no other country in Europe has a

university played such an important role in creating a national culture and in shaping the nation.[81]

References

Anderson, Robert D. (2004): *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford: University Press.

Bienemann, Friedrich (1902): *Der Dorpater Professor Georg Friedrich Parrot und Kaiser Alexander I*. Reval: Franz Kluge.

Blomstedt, Yrjö (1949): "Suomesta kotoisin olevat ylioppilaat Tarton yliopistossa 1802-1852". *Genos* 20. pp. 28-35.

Dhondt, Pieter (2008): "Student mobility in Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The case of Finland". To be published in: Dervin, Fred/Byram, Mike (eds.): *Travelling to study. Students, staff and academic mobility in higher education*. Cambridge: Scholars Publishing.

Engelhardt, Roderich von (1933): *Die deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. (Schriften der deutschen Akademie 13). München: Ernst Reinhardt).

Flynn, James T. (1988): *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 1802-1835* Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Frijhoff, Willem (1997): "Patterns". In: Ridder-Symoens, Hilde de (ed.): *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. II: Universities in the Early Modern Period*. Cambridge: University Press. pp. 43-105.

Garleff, Michel (1987), "Dorpat als Universität der baltischen Provinzen im 19. Jahrhundert". In: Pistohlkors, Gert von (ed.): *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius, 1579-1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost*. (Quellen und Studien zur Baltischen Geschichte 9). Köln: Böhlau. pp. 143-150.

Gernet, Axel von (1902) *Die im Jahre 1802 eröffnete Universität Dorpat und die Wandlungen in ihrer Verfassung. Ein Gedenkblatt zum 21. April 1902*. Reval: Franz Kluge.

Haltzel, Michael (1977): *Der Abbau der deutschen ständischen Selbstverwaltung in den Ostseeprovinzen Russlands. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der russischen Unifizierungspolitik, 1855-1905*. (Marburger Ostforschungen 37). Marburg: J.G. Herder-Institut.

Hecker-Stampehl, Jan (2005): "Functions of Academic Mobility and Foreign Relations in Finnish Academic Life. A Historical Survey from the Middle Ages until the Middle of the 20th Century". In: Gicquel, Catherine-F./Makarov, Victor/ Zolkos, Magdalena (eds.): *The Challenge of Mobility in the Baltic Sea Region*. (The Baltic Sea Region. Nordic Dimensions – European Perspectives 2). Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag. pp. 15-39.

Hehn, Jürgen von (1982) "Das Baltische Deutschtum zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917". In: Ezergailis, Andrew/Pistohlkors, Gert von (eds.): *Die*

[81] Klinge, "Intellectual Tradition in Finland", in: Id., *Let us Be Finns*, 1990, p. 157.

baltischen Provinzen Russlands zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917 (Quellen und Studien zur baltischen Geschichte 4). Köln: Böhlau. pp. 43-57.
Henriksson, Anders (1983) *The tsar's loyal Germans. The Riga German Community: Social Change and the Nationality Question, 1855-1905*. (East European monographs 131). Boulder: East European monographs.
Järvesoo, Elmar (1987): "The Role of Tartu University and Riga Polytechnic Institute in Introducing Rational Agriculture into the Baltic Provinces and Russia". In: Pistohlkors, Gert von (ed.): *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius, 1579-1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost*. (Quellen und Studien zur Baltischen Geschichte 9). Köln: Böhlau. pp. 197-215.
Klinge, Matti/Knapas, Rainer/Leikola, Anto/Strömberg, John (1989): *Keisarillinen Aleksanterin Yliopisto 1808-1917 [The Imperial Alexander University 1808-1917]*. Helsinki: Otava.
Klinge, Matti (1990): *Let us Be Finns - Essays on History* (Helsinki: Otava).
Klinge, Matti (1990): *Eine nordische Universität. Die Universität Helsinki 1640-1990*. Helsinki: Otava.
Klinge, Matti (1993): *The Finnish Tradition. Essays on structures and identities in the North of Europe*. Helsinki: SHS.
Klinge, Matti (1996): "Université et Nation". In: Norrback, Märtha/ Ranki, Kristina (eds.): *University and Nation. The University and the Making of the Nation in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. (Societas Historica Finlandiae. Studia Historica 53). Helsinki: SHS. pp. 13-19.
Kolbe, Laura (1995-1996), "The university town as a Lieu de mémoire: student identity and manifestations at the University of Helsinki 1828-1990". In: *History of Universities*. 14. pp. 181-200.
Kolbe, Laura (1996): "Rural or uban?". In: Norrback, Märtha/Ranki, Kristina (eds.): *University and Nation. The University and the Making of the Nation in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. (Societas Historica Finlandiae. Studia Historica 53). Helsinki: SHS. pp. 51-63.
Konttinen, Esa (1996): "Central Bureaucracy and the Restriction of Education in Early Nineteenth-century Finland". In: *Scandinavian Journal of History*. 21. No. 3. pp. 201-220.
Käbin, Ilo (1986): *Die medizinische Forschung und Lehre an der Universität Dorpat/Tartu 1802-1940. Ergebnisse und Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Medizin*. (Sydsvenska medicinhistoriska sällskapets årsskrift Supplementum 6). Lüneburg: Nordostdeutsches Kulturwerk.
Laar, Mart (2005): *Äratajad. Rahvuslik ärkamisaeg Eestis 19. sajandil ja selle kandjad [Awakeners. The national awaking in Estonia in XIX century and its bearers.]* Tartu: Kirjastus Eesti Ajalooarhiiv.
Lazda, Paulis (1985): "The phenomenon of Russophilism in the development of Latvian Nationalism in the 19th century". In: Loit, Aleksander (ed.): *National movements in the Baltic countries during the nineteenth century*. (Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia 2). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. pp. 129-136.
Leikola, Anto (1996): "In service of the truth or of the Emperor. Some reflections on the loyalties of the University of Finland". In: Norrback, Märtha/ Ranki, Kristina (eds.): *University and Nation. The University and the Making of the Nation*

in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries. (Societas Historica Finlandiae. Studia Historica 53). Helsinki: SHS. pp. 125-130.

Lea Leppik, (2000): "Ein deutscher Professor im Russischen Reich. Über Leben und Werk des Historikers Gustav Ewers". In: Piirimäe, Helmut/Sommerhage, Claus (eds.): *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat*. Tartu: Universität, Lehrstuhl für deutsche Philologie. pp. 113-141.

Majamaa, Raija/Tiirakari, Leeni (2006): *J. V. Snellman. Valtioviisas vaikuttaja.* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1040). Helsinki: SKS.

Maurer, Trude (1998): *Hochschullehrer im Zarenreich. Ein Beitrag zur russischen Sozial- und Bildungsgeschichte*. (Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas 27). Köln: Böhlau.

Meyer, Klaus (1987): "Die Universität im Russischen Reich in der erste Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts". In: Pistohlkors, Gert von (ed.): *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius, 1579-1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost*. (Quellen und Studien zur Baltischen Geschichte 9). Köln: Böhlau. pp. 37-50.

Piirimäe, Helmut (2000): "Wechselvolle Zeiten. Die Entwicklung Dorpats zu einem Zentrum von Wissenschaft und Kultur". In: Piirimäe, Helmut/Sommerhage, Claus (eds.): *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat*. Tartu: Universität, Lehrstuhl für deutsche Philologie. pp. 7-39.

Polvinen, Tuomo (1995): *Imperial Borderland: Bobrikov and the Attempted Russification of Finland 1894-1904*. London: Hurst.

Raun, Toivo U. (1984); "The Revolution of 1905 in the Baltic Provinces and Finland". In: *Slavic Review*. 43. pp. 453-467.

Raun, Toivo U. (1987): "The Role of Tartu University in Estonian Society and Culture, 1860-1914". In: Pistohlkors, Gert von (ed.): *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius, 1579-1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost*. (Quellen und Studien zur Baltischen Geschichte 9). Köln: Böhlau. pp. 123-142.

Rui, Timo (1998): "Die Deutschsprachige Universität Dorpat im 19.Jahrhundert als Hochschulort für Finnland". In: Schweitzer, Robert/Bastman-Bühner, Waltraud (eds.): *Der finnische Meerbusen als Brennpunkt. Wandern und Wirken deutschsprachiger Menschen im europäischen Nordosten*. (Veröffentlichungen der Stiftung zur Förderung deutscher Kultur 9). Helsinki: Stiftung zur Förderung deutscher Kultur. pp. 183-189.

Saarinen, Hannes (1989): "Studien- und Bildungsreisen von Finnen nach Berlin 1809-1914". In: Tammisto, A./Mustakallio, K./Saarinen, Hannes (eds.): *Miscellanea*. (Studia Historica 33). Helsinki: SHS. pp. 203-242.

Schlau, Wilfried (ed.) (1995):, *Die Deutschbalten*. (Studienbuchreihe der Stiftung Ostdeutscher Kulturrat 6). München: Langen Müller.

Semel, Hugo (ed.) (1918): *Die Universität Dorpat (1802-1918). Skizzen zu ihrer Geschichte von Lehrern und ehemaligen Schülern*. Dorpat: Laakmann.

Siilivask, Karl (ed.) (1985): *History of Tartu University 1632-1982*. Tallinn: Periodika.

Stenius, Henrik (1989): "The 'Bildungsbürgertum' and the free discussion in nineteenth century Finland". In: Peltonen, Matti (ed.): *State, Culture & the Bourgeoisie. Aspects of the Peculiarity of the Finnish*. (Jyväskylän yliopisto. Nykykulttuurin tutkimusyksikkö 13) (Jyväskylä: Yliopistopaino). pp. 54-69.

Strümpell, Ludwig (1866): *Rückblick auf die Wirksamheit der Universität Dorpat. Zur Erinnerung an die Jahre von 1802-1865*. Dorpat: Mattiesen.
Tamul, Sirje (2001): "Über die Studentenschaft der russifizierten Tartuer Universität (1883-1918)". In: *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*. 4. pp. 102-111.
Tamul, Villu (1992): "Das Professoreninstitut und der Anteil der Universität Dorpat/Tartu an den russisch-deutschen Wissenschaftskontakten im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts". In: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*. 41. No. 4. pp. 525-542.
Tamul, Villu (2000): "Die Dörptsche Universität – Landes- oder Reichsuniversität? Zum Verhältnis von Deutschbalten, Stadt und Universität im 19. Jahrhundert". In: Piirimäe, Helmut/Sommerhage, Claus (eds.): *Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Dorpat*. Tartu: Universität, Lehrstuhl für deutsche Philologie., pp. 87-112.
Hain Tankler, (1996): "Dorpat, a German-speaking International University in the Russian Empire". In: Norrback, Märtha/ Ranki, Kristina (eds.): *University and Nation. The University and the Making of the Nation in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. (Societas Historica Finlandiae. Studia Historica 53). Helsinki: SHS. pp. 91-100.
Thaden, Edward C. (ed.) (1981): *Russification in the Baltic provinces and Finland, 1855-1914*. Princeton: University Press.
Tommila, Päiviö/Korppi-Tommola, Aura (eds.) (2006): *Research in Finland - A History*. Helsinki: University Press.
Välimaa, Jussi (2004): "Nationalisation, Localisation and Globalisation in Finnish Higher Education". In: *Higher Education*. 48. No. 1. pp. 27-54.
Wittram, Reinhard (1952): "Die Universität Dorpat im 19. Jahrhundert". In: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*. 1. pp. 195-219.